

**TOWN OF GILBERT
PLANNING COMMISSION - STUDY SESSION**

VIA WEBEX VIRTUAL PLATFORM

**Council Chambers
50 E. Civic Center Drive, Gilbert, AZ
June 3, 2020 5:00 p.m.**

COMMISSION PRESENT:

Carl Bloomfield, Vice Chair (Joined at 5:14 pm)
David Cavenee
Noah Mundt
Jän Simon
Philip Alibrandi, Alternate
Nathan Mackin, Alternate

STAFF PRESENT:

Sydney Bethel, Planner II
Stephanie Bubenheim, Senior Planner
Ashlee MacDonald, Senior Planner
Amy Temes, Senior Planner
Eva Cutro, Planning Division Manager
Nancy Davidson, Assistant Town Attorney

COMMISSION ABSENT:

Brian Andersen, Chair

RECORDER:

Dana Desing

COUNCIL LIAISON PRESENT:

Scott September

Due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, which have prompted declarations of a public health emergency at the local, state and federal levels, members of the public will have options to attend the meeting in person or participate remotely.

CALL TO ORDER

Commissioner Cavenee called the Study Session of the Planning Commission to order at 5:04 p.m.

- 1. DR20-71 GUADALUPE & MCQUEEN RETAIL: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 3.28 acres, generally located at the southeast corner of McQueen and Guadalupe Roads, and zoned Community Commercial (CC) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.**

Planner Sydney Bethel presented DR20-71 Guadalupe & McQueen Retail. The subject site is located at the southeast corner of Guadalupe and McQueen Roads, approximately 3.28 gross acres zoned Community Commercial (CC). This area of town is quite built out and this is last commercial corner to be built in this area. Behind the site is the McQueen Landing residential subdivision located to the south and east, which has almost completed construction. Staff has provided first review comments to the applicant.

The site plan consists of three buildings with a variety of uses including restaurant, retail and vehicles services light. Pad A is located on the northwestern corner with a standalone 2,500 SF restaurant with drive through and 800 SF outdoor patio. Pad B on the southern portion of the site is for a retail and restaurant building with four independent suites, three of which will be retail and one will be a restaurant with drive through and patio. Pad C located on the western portion is intended for light automotive use with nine service bays.

The site will have two access points with the primary off of McQueen Road and the secondary off of Guadalupe Road. Pedestrian connectivity is provided throughout the site with internal sidewalks leading out to the existing sidewalks on the right-of-ways for McQueen and Guadalupe. An 8 foot solid CMU wall is proposed on the

southern and eastern boundaries to provide a buffer and some perimeter boundaries for the McQueen Landing residential subdivision. Similar materials and colors are applied throughout the design theme for all of the buildings. The design draws inspiration from the surrounding developments with a modern edge.

The only first review comment on Pad A was the suggestion to bring the windows down to the base of building to provide balance on the south elevation. Pad B for the four retail and restaurant suites is of a similar design with a different massing of the colors and materials to differentiate the four separate suites. For Pad C, the automotive building, staff has recommended that the canopies be raised on the west and north elevations to create more balance, and to provide variation in the columns in between the bays. This has been requested in the past in auto-oriented businesses with bays to provide some movement to such a large elevation. The materials are a combination of stucco, EIFS, and accents of splitface and smooth CMU block and metal. Photos were provided of the surrounding developments showing a desert palette and similar architecture.

Ms. Bethel requested input from the Commission on the proposed elevations for the three buildings as well as general feedback on the project.

QUESTIONS COMMENTS:

Commissioner Mackin agreed with the level of use on the PAD and felt it fits perfectly for the location in terms of commercial development. He thought it was a nice balance of uses. He also agreed with the staff recommendations. Everything looks great.

Commissioner Mundt lived on Kokopelli 10 or so years ago and felt it will be good to fill in the area. There has been a lot of turnover. The gas station across the street had work done he believed due to environmental issues. The elevations look good and it will blend in nicely and fill in that corner.

Commissioner Simon agreed with all of the previous comments.

Commissioner Cavenee liked the layout given the uses proposed. He liked the dumpster layouts and felt they were positioned well considering some of the uses will have food waste. He confirmed with staff that the drive in from south of Guadalupe is within this property boundary and not a shared access. He liked the exterior elevations and felt they were warm and inviting. The colors blend well with the surrounding pieces. He liked the mix of materials with stone and stucco and accents on the cap and with the awnings. For Pad C, staff was looking to vary the long elevation. In addition to columns, he suggested raising the elevation of the corner piece at the entry and making that parapet a little higher to accent the entry point of the building. Each of the buildings has good signage opportunities with dedicated positions. It is certainly not overdone, but was just about the right mix. He felt the Architect has done a very good job.

- 2. Z20-03 TRILOGY AT POWER RANCH: Request to amend Ordinance[s] No. 1450 to amend the conditions of development within the Trilogy at Power Ranch Planned Area Development overlay zoning district (PAD) for approx. 5.74 acres located at 4369 E. Village Parkway, consisting of 5.74 acres of Public Facilities/Institutional (PF/I) zoning district with a PAD as shown on the exhibit (map) available for viewing in the Planning Services Division. The request is to amend the conditions of development to allow a deviation in the development standards along the north and west property boundaries reducing the building and landscape setbacks to 10ft.**

DR19-128 TRILOGY AT POWER RANCH: Tennis and Pickleball Complex: Site plan, landscape, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, colors and materials, for approximately 5.74 acres, located at 4369 E. Village Parkway, and zoned Public Facilities/Institutional (PF/I) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay zoning district.

One comment card was submitted in favor of this item by James Mayes.

Senior Planner Ashlee MacDonald presented Z20-03 and DR19-128, Trilogy at Power Ranch located off Power Road south of Queen Creek Road. The request is for pickleball and tennis court renovations off of Ranch House Parkway, at both sides of the main entry to the site are existing courts. On the west side are two tennis courts. On the east side there are two tennis courts, each of which has been lined to allow four pickleball courts a few years ago. Trilogy has active residents with tennis and pickleball clubs. These are well-utilized courts within the community.

The applicant is requesting a PAD amendment on a 5.74 acre portion of the Power Ranch PAD. The site is currently zoned Public Facilities/Institutional (PD/I) with a PAD. The applicant is seeking to amend the PAD to reduce the front and west side setbacks and landscape setbacks down to 10 feet in the court area.

The DR case is seeking additional courts and reconfiguration of the courts. The modifications requested are for reductions in both the building setback and landscape setback from 25 feet along the frontage down to 10 feet. A drawing was provided showing the encroachment into the required setbacks. With the Design Review, the applicant has proposed a site plan showing the addition of a court on the west side of the site, shifting the courts slightly to accommodate the third court. On the east side of the entry, the applicant has proposed an additional tennis court and reconfiguration of the current courts to allow a total of six dedicated pickleball courts.

The addition of courts and the reconfiguration will impact the landscaping on site. The applicant is still providing ample landscaping with an additional 24 trees as well as shrubs and plants. The landscaping is consistent with what exists there today. The applicant is also proposing two restroom buildings with shaded social areas. Those buildings will match the existing HOA facility buildings on site in terms of materials and colors. Fabric shade canopies are proposed on either side of the entry drive for those court users. Staff has asked the applicant to consider an alternative material that is of higher quality and more durable, or additional information on the proposed canopy. The applicant is proposing a sound wall to help mitigate some of the noise impact of the pickleball courts through a 4 foot retaining wall of stacked stone with a stucco wall behind. Staff has asked for additional information on the wall behind to ensure that it is in compliance with what was recommended in the sound study. That study indicated that it should be a CMU type block material to effectively mitigate the noise.

On the west side of the drive, there is an 18 foot proposed light pole. Although it does meet our standard for the foot candle at the property line, staff has requested information on the impact of this light to the adjoining property. Staff has asked that a house-side shield be installed to limit the glare. Staff has asked the applicant to ensure that the kelvin temperature of the lights is no more than 3000K, which is a warm white that is easier on the eyes at night, and they have complied.

A sound study was completed with on-site noise measurements of the courts as well as an acoustic model for future noise levels with the additional courts. That study recommended an 8 foot wall on the east side of the courts and suggested adding a water feature to help mask the noise. A water feature is not included in the proposal. Staff has provided feedback to the applicant on the noise and asked them to further explain the impacts of the noise wall if sound were to bounce off of that heading west.

There has been considerable public participation on this project, including two community meetings in May of 2019 and February of 2020, and there was input both in support and in opposition. The community feels that this is a much-needed amenity, although there are concerns for the noise with pickleball, traffic and parking issues with the increase in courts, the cost of those to the HOA, and alternative designs not being fully vetted. The Planning Commission will be provided emails and communications received at the time of the Public Hearing.

Ms. MacDonald is seeking input from the Commission regarding the front and side setback deviations requested and the overall site design.

QUESTION/COMMENTS:

Commissioner Cavenee turned the meeting over to Vice Chair Bloomfield.

Commissioner Cavenee noted the setback was one of the more significant deviations requested. He asked if the courts have privacy screening. He understood it is not within the visibility triangle, although he was concerned about the views for ingress and egress into the drive entrance.

Ms. MacDonald advised that the current courts did have the privacy screening. She will verify with the applicant whether that is being planned.

Commissioner Cavenee stated there are some trees on the west side that would have a worse effect to the view of oncoming traffic. It might be nice to make sure traffic is okay with that encroachment. They are not actually doing buildings, but fencing and flat courts in those setback reductions. He was not sure it was really that invasive. Overall, he was in support. Since the sound wall was to mitigate the concerns from homeowners, he asked if pickleball was that much louder than tennis.

Ms. MacDonald stated the sound of the ball off of the racquets is the concern. Some videos have been shared with staff to show that the noise is a little bit higher than tennis.

Commissioner Cavenee noted a concern about parking. Has anyone evaluated the parking use since the four courts are in place? Would this many more courts overwhelm the parking? Has traffic reviewed the plan?

Ms. MacDonald stated there is no requirement for additional parking based on the additional courts, which are part of the HOA facility, which is based off of the building square footage. They are not required to do additional parking based on the addition of the courts. In 2018, the applicant received approval of an Administrative Use Permit to modify parking. Part of that was the requirement to provide a significant amount of parking spaces for golf carts. This is a gated community and some utilize the facilities by golf cart. Counting those spaces, they are in excess of the requirement, so staff did allow them to reduce the parking for their facilities and they redesigned their parking lot. The parking was evaluated with the 2018 request.

Commissioner Cavenee was okay with everything given staff's explanation. He did not want to add unnecessary cost to the HOA, although he agreed that the fabric canopy in the sun will become a maintenance challenge. It might make sense to spend the money up front and do metal roofing like in the ramadas and restrooms. He would recommend a matching hard surface for the shade element.

Commissioner Alibrandi was fairly familiar with this area. The courts are tucked off to the sides so there is really no traffic or visibility problem, nor is the parking an issue there. He had no problem with the HOA using its own land. One court is already close to the residential area. He did not imagine the noise could be that much worse. He had no problems with the proposal at all.

Vice Chair Bloomfield felt the shielding would take care of any concerns with the lighting. He asked if a concern was brought up by the neighbor who might be affected.

Ms. MacDonald has not heard anything in particular from that neighbor. It is one of the items that is encroaching into what the required setback would be and stood out as something that might need addressing.

Vice Chair Bloomfield agreed and was just curious if it was brought on by a concern or complaint from the neighbor. If we feel like it could be an issue there, then we should request that it be discussed with that neighbor. One of the questions was whether the sound wall will impact the noise. He noted the applicant is adding more trees in the area. The addition of trees and vegetative material works well to soften sounds and prevent them from traveling far. He did not feel that was going to be an issue, although he was anxious to hear the residents' concerns more fully. This is not an aggressive position for us because it is internal to their

community and is more of an HOA driven request. He was not sure he had any concerns, but was interested to hear the public input.

3. ST20-08 ENCLAVE AT MADERA PARC: Three (3) new standard plans (Plans 1673, 1751, 1891,) by American Homes 4Rent for Lots 1-51, on approximately 10.45 acres generally located south of Madera Parc Drive and east of Cooper Road in the Single Family-Detached (SF-D) zoning district with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

Planner Stephanie Bubenheim presented ST20-08, Enclave at Madera Park, three new standard plans. The site is located northeast of Cooper and Warner Roads. In 2018, the site went through a rezoning for part of the church parking lot and retention area to SF-D and the final plat has been approved. Tonight, we are just looking at the standard plans for 51 lots. The typical lot size is 45' by 72' and all of the homes will be two story, for-rent product. There are three standard plans, four color schemes and four elevation styles, Southwestern Bungalow, Arizona Ranch, Traditional and Modern Prairie. Since the staff report was written, the applicant has provided updated exhibits. The elevation matrix was reviewed.

Staff's first review comment were to have more architectural elements that differentiate the four elevations as they seemed quite similar. The applicant has incorporated brick and stone wainscoting, although staff is looking for additional elements that are true to style. Staff has asked for further architectural elements for the rear elevations and suggested shutters for the second story windows since some units will be seen from neighboring properties. Staff felt the color schemes were too similar and the applicant has updated one to more gray neutral tones. The applicant has provided an updated elevation matrix with varying rooflines for the Southwestern Bungalow, shutters added to a few elevations, and windows that have been added or modified.

Staff is looking for Commission input on the elevation styles, whether the architectural elements are true to style, the variety in color schemes, and overall feedback on the architecture, elevations and rooflines.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:

Commissioner Cavenee agreed that there was not much difference between the four themes. He understood they were trying to stay with the same floor plan and structure, with changes to the façade. He would encourage even more variation, perhaps through additional materials. The Traditional has some stone on the columns, which is different. He would suggest more of that type of work to differentiate the themes. Given the product, it is probably as good as it might get. The color palettes are very similar. He was not sure in a neighborhood setting they would feel that differentiated. There are a few bold colors, but for the most part it will feel monolithic in the color scheme. He understood you don't want to get too dramatic in a for rent product, although he felt it needed more variation so that the styles really jump.

Commissioner Mackin agreed that there needs to be more detailing. The southern and side elevations are lacking, especially those exposed to view. He understood the intent was for rent product probably for corporate housing. He asked if there was anything preventing the developer from deciding to sell these as individual homes at some point.

Ms. Bubenheim will follow up with the applicant in that regard.

Commissioner Mackin felt if at any time this could become a single-family residential neighborhood, it needs to have a lot of the same high standards that we would impose on any single-family residential neighborhood. He understood the need to be cost effective with a rental product. He felt we need to be sensitive to the potential that this could be converted in the future to single-family residential. He concurred that there needs to be more detailing either way to make sure it is not too uniform.

Vice Chair Bloomfield remembered that when this came through for rezoning it was hotly disputed with a lot of concerns about the units being jammed together. Their ability to differentiate will go a long way in addressing those concerns from the adjacent neighborhood. It can't be terribly upscale as they don't have the density to be able to do that well. It is a nice neighborhood and is one of Gilbert's seasoned neighborhoods. He liked the differentiation of the colors, but agreed with all of the Commission comments about the lack of differentiation between styles. He felt that deserved a second look. They have made some small easy adjustments, but perhaps some more restyling such as adding a pillar or post and a small fence across the front to the extent that can be done within their price point. They had made some illustrations to the neighbors as to what this development might look like, and we want them to be true to that.

Vice Chair Bloomfield recessed the Study Session for a short break at 5:44 p.m.

Vice Chair Bloomfield reconvened the Study Session at 5:58 p.m. to discuss the agenda.

4. Discussion of Regular Meeting Agenda:

Vice Chair Bloomfield asked if there were any concerns with the agenda or conflicts. There were none.

ADJOURN STUDY SESSION

Vice Chair Bloomfield adjourned the Study Session at 6:00 p.m.

Carl Bloomfield, Vice Chair

ATTEST:

Dana Desing, Recording Secretary

**TOWN OF GILBERT
PLANNING COMMISSION - REGULAR MEETING
VIA WEBEX VIRTUAL PLATFORM
Council Chambers
50 E. Civic Center Drive, Gilbert, AZ
June 3, 2020 6:00 p.m.**

COMMISSION PRESENT:

Brian Andersen, Chair
Carl Bloomfield, Vice Chair
David Cavenee
Noah Mundt
Jän Simon
Philip Alibrandi, Alternate
Nathan Mackin, Alternate

STAFF PRESENT:

Sydney Bethel, Planner II
Stephanie Bubenheim, Senior Planner
Ashlee MacDonald, Senior Planner
Amy Temes, Senior Planner
Eva Cutro, Planning Division Manager
Nancy Davidson, Assistant Town Attorney

COUNCIL LIAISON PRESENT:

Scott September

RECORDER:

Dana Desing

Due to the impacts of the [COVID-19 pandemic](#), which have prompted declarations of a public health emergency at the local, state and federal levels, members of the public will have options to attend the meeting in person or participate remotely.

PLANNER	CASE	PAGE	VOTE
Ashlee MacDonald	S20-01		Continued
Stephanie Bubenheim	DR20-44 (DR00-14-B)		Approved
Stephanie Bubenheim	DR20-47		Approved

CALL TO ORDER OF REGULAR MEETING

Vice Chair Bloomfield called the Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 6:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Councilmember Scott September led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Planning Division Manager Eva Cutro called roll and determined that a quorum was present.

5. Approval of Agenda

Chair Andersen called for a motion to approve the agenda as there were no changes requested.

MOTION: Vice Chair Bloomfield moved to approve the Agenda as written; seconded by Commissioner Cavenee. **Motion passed 7-0.**

COMMUNICATIONS

6. Communication from Citizens

At this time, members of the public may comment on matters within the jurisdiction of the Town but not on the agenda. The Commission response is limited to responding to criticism, asking staff to review a matter commented upon, or asking that a matter be put on a future agenda.

There were no requests to speak.

7. Report from Council Liaison on Current Events

Councilmember Scott September reported on a presentation by Dan Henderson, our Economic Development Director, about our historic district and the vision for that area. The forward-thinking vision includes elements of the Vaughn relief road and a pedestrian/bike path that would traverse through the historic district called the Paseo. This really promotes multimodal transportation and ties into a lot of other bike paths in the area. He has asked Mr. Henderson to present to Planning Commission at the next meeting in July. He was excited about this vision and felt it important for the Commission to see that vision and to be part of that going forward.

Chair Andersen felt that whole area will be really cool looking 10 years from now. He was looking forward to seeing that vision.

PUBLIC HEARING (CONSENT)

All items listed below are considered the public hearing consent calendar. The Commission may, by a single motion, approve any number of items where, after opening the public hearing, no person requests the item be removed from the consent calendar. If such a request is made, the Commission shall then withdraw the item from the public hearing consent calendar for the purpose of public discussion and separate action. Other items on the agenda may be added to the consent calendar and approved under a single motion.

Chair Andersen read the Consent Calendar items. He then opened and closed the public hearing.

- 8. S20-01 WARNER MEADOWS: Request to approve Preliminary Plat and Open Space Plan for Warner Meadows, for 476 home lots (Lots 1-476) on approx. 94.18 acres located at the northeast corner of Warner and Recker Roads in the Single Family - Attached (SF-A), Single Family - Detached (SF-D), Single Family - 6 (SF-6) and Single Family -7 (SF-7) zoning districts all with a Planned Area Development Overlay zoning district.**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Due to a public notice deficiency, this item will need to be **continued** to the July 1, 2020 Planning Commission hearing.

- 9. DR20-44 (DR00-14-B) CBRE GREEN EXPANSION: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 18.83 acres generally located on the southwest corner of Space Place and Elliot Roads, and pending rezoning to General Industrial (GI) zoning district.**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve the Findings of Fact and approve DR20-44 (DR00-14-B), CBRE Green Expansion: site plan, landscape, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, colors and materials for approximately 18.83 acres, generally located at the southwest corner of Space Place and Elliot Road and zoned General Industrial (GI), subject to conditions:

1. Construction of the project shall conform to the exhibits approved by the Planning Commission at the June 3, 2020 public hearing.
2. The construction site plan documents shall incorporate the Standard Commercial and Industrial Site Plan Notes adopted by the Design Review Board on March 11, 2004.
3. Signage is not included in this approval. Administrative Design Review approval is required prior to submitting for monument sign permits.
4. The existing designated sidewalk area leading from Elliot Road ROW to the existing building shall be constructed as a raised sidewalk, construction document submittal shall incorporate revised plans depicting a raised sidewalk.
5. The site is considered a multiple and large water meter user and is required to enter into a Sustainable Water Service Development Agreement with the town prior to issuance of a building permit.

10. DR20-47 BUSHTEX: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 3.15 acres, generally located east of the southeast corner of Cooper and Guadalupe Roads, and zoned Light Industrial (LI).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve the Findings of Fact and approve DR20-47, BushTex: site plan, landscape, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, colors and materials for approximately 3.15 acres, generally located east of the southeast corner of Cooper and Guadalupe Roads and zoned Light Industrial (LI), subject to conditions:

1. Construction of the project shall conform to the exhibits approved by the Planning Commission at the June 3, 2020 public hearing.
2. The construction site plan documents shall incorporate the Standard Commercial and Industrial Site Plan Notes adopted by the Design Review Board on March 11, 2004.
3. Signage is not included in this approval. Administrative Design Review approval is required prior to submitting for monument sign permits.
4. Existing buildings on Demo Site Plan must be removed prior to certificate of occupancy.

MOTION: Vice Chair Bloomfield moved to recommend approval of Consent Agenda Items 8. S20-01 Warner Meadows (Continued to the July 1, 2020 hearing); 9. DR20-44 (DR00-14-B) CBRE Green Expansion; and 10. DR20-47 BushTex; seconded by Commissioner Cavenee. **Motion passed 7-0.**

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- 11. Planning Commission Minutes** - Consider approval of the minutes of the Study Session and Regular Meeting of May 6, 2020.

MOTION: Vice Chair Bloomfield moved to approve the minutes of the Study Session and Regular Meeting of May 6, 2020; seconded by Commissioner Cavenee. **Motion passed 7-0.**

COMMUNICATIONS

- 12. Report from Chairman and Members of the Commission on current events**

There were no reports.

13. Report from Planning Services Manager on current events

Eva Cutro reported that Municipal Building II has started a slow opening. The counter has been open to the public since this Monday. She thanked everyone for adjusting to the WebEx meeting format.

Chair Andersen thanked Ms. Cutro and staff for running the meetings so smoothly with the virtual format.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business before the Planning Commission, Chair Andersen adjourned the Regular Meeting at 6:10 p.m.

Brian Andersen, Chairman

ATTEST:

Dana Desing, Recording Secretary